

Inf-convolution of G -expectations

Xuepeng Bai Rainer Buckdahn^Y

School of Mathematics, Shandong University, 250100 Jinan, P.R. China
Email: xuepeng.bai@gmail.com

^YUniversité de Bretagne Occidentale, Laboratoire de Mathématiques, CNRS-UMR 6205,
F-29238 BREST Cedex 3, France
Email: Rainer.Buckdahn@univ-brest.fr

Abstract

In this paper we will discuss the optimal risk transfer problems when risk measures are generated by G -expectations, and we present the relationship between inf-convolution of G -expectations and the inf-convolution of drivers G .

Keywords: inf-convolution, G -expectation, G -normal distribution, G -Brownian motion

1 Introduction

Coherent risk measures were introduced by Artzner et al. [1] in finite probability spaces and lately by Delbaen [8,9] in general probability spaces. The family of coherent risk measures was extended later by Föllmer and Schied [10,11] and, independently, by Frittelli and Rosazza Gianin [12,13] to the class of convex risk measures.

The notion of g -expectations was introduced by Peng [15] as solutions to a class of nonlinear Backward Stochastic Differential Equations (BSDE in short) which were first studied by Pardoux and Peng [14]. Financial applications were discussed in detail by El Karoui et al. [6].

Let us introduce the optimal risk transfer model we are concerned with. This model can be briefly described as follows:

Two economic agents A and B are considered, who assess the risk associated with their respective positions by risk measures ρ_A and ρ_B . The issuer, agent A , with the total risk capital X , wants to issue a financial product F and sell it to agent B for the price π in order to reduce his risk

Corresponding author

exposure. His objective is to minimize $\rho_A(X - F + \cdot)$ with respect to F and \cdot , while the interest of buyer B is not to be exposed to a greater risk after the transaction:

$$\rho_B(F - \cdot) - \rho_B(0):$$

Using the cash translation invariance property, this optimization problem can be rewritten in the simpler form

$$\inf_F \rho_A(X - F) + \rho_B(F)g:$$

This problem was first studied by ElKaroui and Pauline Barrieu [2,3,4] for convex risk measures, in particular those described by g -expectation.

Related with the pioneering paper [1] on coherent risk measures, sublinear expectations (or, more generally, convex expectations, see [10,11,13]) have become more and more popular for modeling such risk measures. Indeed, in any sublinear expectation space $(\cdot; H; \hat{E})$ a coherent risk measure can be defined in a simple way by putting $\rho(X) := \hat{E}[X]$; for $X \in H$.

The notion of a sublinear expectation named G -expectation was first introduced by Peng [17,18] in 2006. Compared with g -expectations, the theory of G -expectation is intrinsic in the sense that it is not based on a given (linear) probability space. A G -expectation is a fully nonlinear expectation. It characterizes the variance uncertainty of a random variable. We recall that the problem of mean uncertainty has been studied by Chen-Epstein through g -expectation in [5]. Under this fully nonlinear G -expectation, a new type of Itô's formula has been obtained, and the existence and uniqueness for stochastic differential equation driven by a G -Brownian motion have been shown. For a more detailed description the reader is referred to Peng's recent papers [17,18,19].

This paper focuses on the mentioned optimization problem where the g -risk measures are replaced by one dimensional G -expectations, i.e., the problem:

$$\hat{E}_{G_1} - \hat{E}_{G_2}[X] := \inf_F \hat{E}_{G_1}[X - F] + \hat{E}_{G_2}[F]g:$$

The main aim of this paper is to present the relationship between the above introduced operator $\hat{E}_{G_1} - \hat{E}_{G_2}[\cdot]$ and the G -expectation $\hat{E}_{G_1 - G_2}[\cdot]$. More precisely, we show that both operators coincide if $G_1 - G_2 \in \mathcal{L}_1$:

In this paper we constrain ourselves to one dimensional G -expectation, the multi-dimensional case is much more complicated and we hope to study this case in a forthcoming publication.

Our approach is mainly based on the recent results by Peng [19] which allow to show that $\hat{E}_{G_1} - \hat{E}_{G_2}[\cdot]$ constructed by inf-convolution of $\hat{E}_{G_1}[\cdot]$ and $\hat{E}_{G_2}[\cdot]$ satisfies the properties of G -expectation. To our best knowledge, this is the first paper that uses the results of Theorem 4.1.3 of [19] to prove that a given nonlinear expectation is a G -expectation.

This paper is organized as follows: while basic definitions and properties of G -expectation and G -Brownian Motion are recalled in Section 2, Section 3 states and proves the main result of this paper: If $G_1, G_2 \in \mathcal{G}$, then $\hat{E}_{G_1} \hat{E}_{G_2}[\cdot]$ also is a G -expectation and

$$\hat{E}_{G_1} \hat{E}_{G_2}[\cdot] = \hat{E}_{G_1 \vee G_2}[\cdot]:$$

2 Notation and Preliminaries

The aim of this section is to recall some basic definitions and properties of G -expectations and G -Brownian motions, which will be needed in the sequel. The reader interested in a more detailed description of these notions is referred to Peng's recent papers [17,18,19].

Adapting Peng's approach in [19], we let \mathcal{X} be a given nonempty fundamental space and H be a linear space of real functions defined on \mathcal{X} such that :

- i) $1 \in H$.
- ii) H is stable with respect to local Lipschitz functions, i.e. for all $n \geq 1$, and for all $X_1, \dots, X_n \in H$, $f \in C_{lip}(\mathbb{R}^n)$; it holds also $f(X_1, \dots, X_n) \in H$.

Recall that $C_{lip}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ denotes the space of all local Lipschitz functions f over \mathbb{R}^n satisfying

$$|f(x) - f(y)| \leq C(1 + |x|^m + |y|^m)|x - y|; x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n;$$

for some $C > 0; m \geq N$ depending on f . The set H is interpreted as the space of random variables defined on \mathcal{X} .

Definition 2.1 A sublinear expectation \hat{E} on H is a functional $H \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with the following properties : for all $X, Y \in H$, we have

- (a) Monotonicity: if $X \leq Y$ then $\hat{E}[X] \leq \hat{E}[Y]$;
- (b) Preservation of constants: $\hat{E}[c] = c$; for all reals c .
- (c) Sub-additivity (or property of self-dominacy):

$$\hat{E}[X] \leq \hat{E}[Y] \leq \hat{E}[X + Y];$$

- (d) Positive homogeneity: $\hat{E}[\lambda X] = \lambda \hat{E}[X]; \lambda \geq 0$;

The triple $(\mathcal{X}; H; \hat{E})$ is called a sublinear expectation space. It generalizes the classical case of the linear expectation $E[X] = \int_{\mathbb{R}} X dP; X \in L^1(\mathcal{X}; \mathcal{F}; P)$; over a probability space $(\mathcal{X}; \mathcal{F}; P)$: Moreover, $\rho(X) = -\hat{E}[X]$ defines a coherent risk measure on H .

Definition 2.2 For arbitrary $n, m \geq 1$; a random vector $Y = (Y_1; Y_2; \dots; Y_n) \in H^n (= H \times \dots \times H)$ is said to be independent of $X \in H^m$ under $\hat{E}[\cdot]$ if for each test function $\varphi \in C_{lip}(\mathbb{R}^{n+m})$ we have

$$\hat{E}[\varphi(X; Y)] = \hat{E}[\hat{E}[\varphi(x; Y)]_{x=X}]:$$

Remark: In the case of linear expectation, this notion of independence is just the classical one. It is important to note that under sublinear expectations the condition Y is independent to X does not imply automatically that X is independent to Y .

Let $X = (X_1; \dots; X_n) \in H^n$ be a given random vector. We define a functional on $C_{lip}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ by

$$\hat{F}_X[\varphi] = \hat{E}[\varphi(X)]; \varphi \in C_{lip}(\mathbb{R}^n):$$

It's easy to check that $\hat{F}_X[\cdot]$ is a sublinear expectation defined on $(\mathbb{R}; C_{lip}(\mathbb{R}^n))$.

Definition 2.3 Given two sublinear expectation spaces $(\cdot; H; \hat{E})$ and $(\cdot; \mathbb{H}; \hat{\mathbb{E}})$, two random vectors $X \in H^n$ and $Y \in \mathbb{H}^n$ are said to be identically distributed if for each test function $\varphi \in C_{lip}(\mathbb{R}^n)$

$$\hat{F}_X[\varphi] = \hat{\mathbb{E}}_Y[\varphi]:$$

We now introduce the important notion of G -normal distribution. For this, let $0 \leq \gamma \leq 1$, and let G be the sublinear function:

$$G(\cdot) = \frac{1}{2}(\gamma^2 + \gamma^2); \gamma \in \mathbb{R}:$$

As usual $\gamma^+ = \max\{0, \gamma\}$ and $\gamma^- = (\gamma^+)^+$: Given an arbitrary initial condition $\varphi \in C_{lip}(\mathbb{R})$, we denote by u_φ the unique viscosity solution of the following parabolic partial differential equation (PDE):

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t u_\varphi(t; x) &= G(\partial_{xx}^2 u_\varphi(t; x)); & (t; x) \in (0; 1) \times \mathbb{R}; \\ u_\varphi(0; x) &= \varphi(x); & x \in \mathbb{R}; \end{aligned}$$

Definition 2.4: A random variable X in a sub-expectation space $(\cdot; H; \hat{E})$ is called G_γ -normal distributed, and we write $X \sim N(0; [\gamma^2; \gamma^2])$, if for all $\varphi \in C_{lip}(\mathbb{R})$;

$$\hat{E}[\varphi(x + \gamma^+ t X)] = u_\varphi(t; x); \quad (t; x) \in [0; 1) \times \mathbb{R}:$$

Remark: From [18], we have the following Kolmogorov-Chapman chain rule:

$$u, (t+s; x) = \hat{E}[u, (t; x + \overset{P}{-} sX)]; \quad s \geq 0:$$

In what follows we will take as fundamental space the space $C_0(\mathbb{R}^+)$ of all real-valued continuous functions $(!_t)_{t \geq 0}$ with $!_0 = 0$, equipped with the topology generated by the uniform convergence on compacts.

For each fixed $T \geq 0$, we consider the following space of local Lipschitz functionals:

$$\begin{aligned} H_T &= \text{Lip}(F_T): \\ &= fX(!) = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} (!_{t_1}; \dots; !_{t_m}); t_1; \dots; t_m \in [0; T]; \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} C_{\text{Lip}}(R^m); m \geq 1. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, for $0 \leq s \leq t$, we define

$$\begin{aligned} H_t^s &= \text{Lip}(F_t^s): \\ &= fX(!) = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} (!_{t_2} - !_{t_1}; \dots; !_{t_{m+1}} - !_{t_m}); t_1; \dots; t_{m+1} \in [s; t]; \\ &\quad \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} C_{\text{Lip}}(R^m); m \geq 1. \end{aligned}$$

It is clear that $H_t^s \subset H_t \subset \text{Lip}(F_T)$; for $s \leq t \leq T$. We also introduce the space

$$H = \text{Lip}(F) := \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \text{Lip}(F_n):$$

Obviously, $\text{Lip}(F_t^s)$; $\text{Lip}(F_T)$ and $\text{Lip}(F)$ are vector lattices.

We will consider the canonical space and set

$$B_t(!) = !_t; t \in [0; 1]; \text{ for } ! \in H:$$

Obviously, for each $t \in [0; 1]$; $B_t \in \text{Lip}(F_t)$: Let $G(a) = G_{-}(a) = \frac{1}{2}(\overline{a}^2 - \underline{a}^2)$; $a \in \mathbb{R}$: We now introduce a sublinear expectation \hat{E} defined on $H_T = \text{Lip}(F_T)$; as well as on $H = \text{Lip}(F)$; via the following procedure: For each $X \in H_T$ with

$$X = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} (B_{t_1} - B_{t_0}; B_{t_2} - B_{t_1}; \dots; B_{t_m} - B_{t_{m-1}});$$

and for all $\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} C_{\text{Lip}}(R^m) < \infty$ and $0 = t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_m \leq T$; $m \geq 1$; we set

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{E}[\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} (B_{t_1} - B_{t_0}; B_{t_2} - B_{t_1}; \dots; B_{t_m} - B_{t_{m-1}})] \\ = \hat{E}[\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \left(\overset{P}{\overline{B_{t_1} - B_{t_0}}}_{t_1 - t_0}; \dots; \overset{P}{\overline{B_{t_m} - B_{t_{m-1}}}}_{t_m - t_{m-1}} \right)]; \end{aligned}$$

where $(\xi_1; \dots; \xi_m)$ is an m -dimensional random vector in some sublinear expectation space $(\mathcal{E}; \mathcal{H}; \hat{E})$; such that $\xi_i \in N(0; [\overline{\xi_i^2}; \underline{\xi_i^2}])$ and ξ_{i+1} is independent of $(\xi_1; \dots; \xi_i)$; for all $i = 1; \dots; m-1$; $m \geq 2$: The related conditional

expectation of $X = \varphi(B_{t_1} - B_{t_0}; B_{t_2} - B_{t_1}; \dots; B_{t_m} - B_{t_{m-1}})$ under H_{t_j} is defined by

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{E}[X | \mathcal{H}_{t_j}] &= \hat{E}[\varphi(B_{t_1} - B_{t_0}; B_{t_2} - B_{t_1}; \dots; B_{t_m} - B_{t_{m-1}}) | \mathcal{H}_{t_j}] \\ &= \varphi(B_{t_1} - B_{t_0}; \dots; B_{t_j} - B_{t_{j-1}})\end{aligned}$$

where

$$(x_1; \dots; x_j) = \mathbb{E}[\varphi(x_1; \dots; x_j; \overset{P}{\overbrace{t_{j+1} - t_{j+1}}}, \dots, \overset{P}{\overbrace{t_m - t_{m-1-m}}})]:$$

We know from [18,19] that $\hat{E}[\cdot]$ defines consistently a sublinear expectation on $\text{Lip}(\mathbb{F})$; satisfying (a)–(d) in Definition 2.1. The reader interested in a more detailed discussion is referred to [18,19].

Definition 2.5 The expectation $\hat{E}[\cdot] : \text{Lip}(\mathbb{F}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined through the above procedure is called G_{φ} -expectation. The corresponding canonical process $(B_t)_{t \geq 0}$ in the sublinear expectation is called a G_{φ} -Brownian motion on $(\cdot; H; \hat{E})$.

At the end of this section we list some useful properties that we will need in Section 3.

Proposition 2.6 ([18,19]) The following properties of $\hat{E}[\cdot | \mathcal{H}_t]$ hold for all $X, Y \in H = \text{Lip}(\mathbb{F})$:

- (a') If $X = Y$, then $\hat{E}[X | \mathcal{H}_t] = \hat{E}[Y | \mathcal{H}_t]$;
- (b') $\hat{E}[\cdot | \mathcal{H}_t] = \cdot$; for each $t \in [0, 1)$ and $\cdot \in H_t$.
- (c') $\hat{E}[X | \mathcal{H}_t] = \hat{E}[Y | \mathcal{H}_t] + \hat{E}[X - Y | \mathcal{H}_t]$;
- (d') $\hat{E}[X + Y | \mathcal{H}_t] = \hat{E}[X | \mathcal{H}_t] + \hat{E}[Y | \mathcal{H}_t]$; for each $\cdot \in H_t$.

We also have

$$\hat{E}[\hat{E}[X | \mathcal{H}_t] | \mathcal{H}_s] = \hat{E}[X | \mathcal{H}_{t \wedge s}]; \text{ and in particular, } \hat{E}[\hat{E}[X | \mathcal{H}_t]] = \hat{E}[X]:$$

For each $X \in \text{Lip}(\mathbb{F}_T^t)$; $\hat{E}[X | \mathcal{H}_t] = \hat{E}[X]$; moreover, the properties (b') and (c') imply: $\hat{E}[X + Y | \mathcal{H}_t] = \hat{E}[X | \mathcal{H}_t] + \hat{E}[Y | \mathcal{H}_t]$; whenever $\cdot \in H_t$:

We will need also the following two propositions, and for proofs the reader is referred to [18,19].

Proposition 2.7 For each convex function φ and each concave function ψ with $\varphi(B_t)$ and $\psi(B_t) \in H_t$, we have $\hat{E}[\varphi(B_t)] = E[\varphi(W_t)]$ and $\hat{E}[\psi(B_t)] = E[\psi(W_t)]$, where $(W_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is a Brownian motion under the linear expectation E .

Proposition 2.8 Let $\hat{E}_1[\cdot]$ and $\hat{E}_2[\cdot]$ be a G_{φ_1} - and a G_{φ_2} -expectation on the space $(\cdot; H)$; respectively. Then, if $[\varphi_1; \varphi_1] \leq [\varphi_2; \varphi_2]$; we have $\hat{E}_1[X] \leq \hat{E}_2[X]$ and $\hat{E}_1[X | \mathcal{H}_t] \leq \hat{E}_2[X | \mathcal{H}_t]$, for all $X \in H$ and all $t \geq 0$:

3 Inf-convolution of G -expectations

The aim of this section is to state the main result of this paper, that is the relationship between the inf-convolution $\hat{E}_{G_1} \hat{E}_{G_2}[\cdot]$ and the G -expectation $\hat{E}_{G_1 \# G_2}[\cdot]$. We begin with the definitions necessary for the understanding of these both expressions.

For given $0 \leq \tau_i \leq 1, i = 1, 2$, let $G_i = G_{\tau_i, \tau_i}$ and we denote by $\hat{E}_i[\cdot]$ the G_i -expectation $\hat{E}_{G_i}[\cdot]$ on $(\cdot; H) = (C_0(\mathbb{R}^+); \text{Lip}(F))$: The inf-convolution of $\hat{E}_1[\cdot]$ with $\hat{E}_2[\cdot]$, denoted by $\hat{E}_1 \hat{E}_2[\cdot]$ is defined as :

$$\hat{E}_1 \hat{E}_2[X] = \inf_{F \in H} \hat{E}_1[X - F] + \hat{E}_2[F]; \quad X \in H :$$

Notice that $\hat{E}_1 \hat{E}_2[\cdot] : H \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$:

In the same way we define

$$G_1 \# G_2(x) = \inf_{y \in \mathbb{R}} G_1(x - y) + G_2(y); \quad x \in \mathbb{R} :$$

Observe also that $G_1 \# G_2(\cdot) : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$: It is easy to check that $G_1 \# G_2(\cdot)$ has the following form :

$$G_1 \# G_2(x) = \begin{cases} 1; & [L_1; \tau_1] \cap [L_2; \tau_2] = \emptyset; \\ \frac{1}{2}(\tau_1^2 x^+ + \tau_2^2 x^-); & [L_1; \tau_1] \cap [L_2; \tau_2] \neq \emptyset; \end{cases}$$

If $G_1 \# G_2(\cdot) = 1$, then also $\hat{E}_1 \hat{E}_2[\cdot] = 1$. More precisely, we have the following proposition:

Proposition 3.1 If $[L_1; \tau_1] \cap [L_2; \tau_2] = \emptyset$, then $\hat{E}_1 \hat{E}_2[X] = 1$, for all $X \in H$:

Proof: Without loss of generality we may suppose $\tau_1 < \tau_2$: Choosing $F = B_{\tau_1}^2$; $\tau_1 > 0$; $\tau_2 > 0$; we then have due to Proposition 2.7 that for all $X \in H$;

$$\begin{aligned} & \hat{E}_1[X - F] + \hat{E}_2[F] \\ &= \hat{E}_1[X + B_{\tau_1}^2] + \hat{E}_2[B_{\tau_1}^2] \\ &= \hat{E}_1[X] + \hat{E}_1[B_{\tau_1}^2] + \hat{E}_2[B_{\tau_1}^2] \\ &= \hat{E}_1[X] + \tau_1^2 \tau_2^2 \end{aligned}$$

Letting $\tau_1 \rightarrow 1$; we obtain $\hat{E}_1 \hat{E}_2[X] = 1$:

If $[L_1; \tau_1] \cap [L_2; \tau_2] \neq \emptyset$ we have the following theorem, which is the main result of this paper.

Theorem 3.2 Let $\hat{E}_1[\cdot]$ and $\hat{E}_2[\cdot]$ be the two G -expectations on the space $(\cdot; H)$; which have been defined above. If $G_1 \# G_2(\cdot) \neq 1$, then

$\hat{E}_1 \hat{E}_2[\cdot]$ is a G -expectation on $(\cdot; H)$ and has the driver $G_1 \sharp G_2$; i.e.,
 $\hat{E}_1 \hat{E}_2[\cdot] = \hat{E}_{G_1 \sharp G_2}[\cdot]$:

Let us first discuss Theorem 3.2 in the special case.

Lemma 3.3 Let $[\cdot_1; \bar{\cdot}_1] \quad [\cdot_2; \bar{\cdot}_2]$: Then $G_1 \sharp G_2(\cdot) = G(\cdot)$, as well as
 $\hat{E}_1 \hat{E}_2[\cdot] = \hat{E}_1[\cdot]$:

Proof: We already know that $G_1 \sharp G_2(\cdot) = G(\cdot)$; so it remains only to prove that $\hat{E}_1 \hat{E}_2[\cdot] = \hat{E}_1[\cdot]$: For this we note that, firstly, by choosing $F = 0$ in the definition of $\hat{E}_1 \hat{E}_2$; we get $\hat{E}_1 \hat{E}_2 \hat{E}_i$; $i = 1, 2$:
On the other hand, due to Proposition 2.8 we know that $\hat{E}_1 \hat{E}_2$: Thus, from the subadditivity of $\hat{E}_1[\cdot]$;

$$\hat{E}_1[X - F] + \hat{E}_2[F] \leq \hat{E}_1[X - F] + \hat{E}_1[F] \leq \hat{E}_1[X]; F \in H:$$

Consequently, $\hat{E}_1 \hat{E}_2[\cdot] = \hat{E}_1[\cdot]$. Thus, Theorem 3.2 holds true in this special case.

The case $[\cdot_1; \bar{\cdot}_1] \quad [\cdot_2; \bar{\cdot}_2]$ can be treated analogously.

The situation becomes more complicated if neither $[\cdot_1; \bar{\cdot}_1] \quad [\cdot_2; \bar{\cdot}_2]$ nor $[\cdot_2; \bar{\cdot}_2] \quad [\cdot_1; \bar{\cdot}_1]$: Without loss of generality, we suppose that $[\cdot_1; \bar{\cdot}_1] \neq [\cdot_2; \bar{\cdot}_2] = [\cdot_2; \bar{\cdot}_1]$: In this case

$$G_1 \sharp G_2(x) = \frac{1}{2}(\sigma_1^2 x^+ - \sigma_2^2 x^-) = G_3(x); x \in \mathbb{R};$$

where $G_3 = G_{\sigma_2, \bar{\cdot}_1}$. By $\hat{E}_3[\cdot]$ we denote the G -expectation on $(\cdot; H)$ with driver $G_3(\cdot)$. The above notations will be kept for the rest of the paper. Our aim is to prove that $\hat{E}_1 \hat{E}_2[\cdot] = \hat{E}_3[\cdot]$:

The proof is based on Theorem 4.1.3 in Peng's paper [19]; this theorem characterizes the intrinsic properties of G -Brownian motions and G -expectations.

Lemma 3.4 (see Theorem 4.1.3, Peng [19]) Let $(\mathbb{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ be a process defined in the sub-expectation space $(\mathbb{C}; \mathbb{H}; \mathbb{E})$ such that

- (i) $\mathbb{F}_0 = 0$;
- (ii) For each $t, s \geq 0$; the increment $\mathbb{F}_{t+s} - \mathbb{F}_t$ has the same distribution as \mathbb{F}_s and is independent of $(\mathbb{F}_{t_1}, \mathbb{F}_{t_2}, \dots, \mathbb{F}_{t_n})$, for all $0 \leq t_1, \dots, t_n \leq t$; $n \geq 1$;
- (iii) $\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{F}_t] = \mathbb{E}[-\mathbb{F}_t] = 0$; and $\lim_{t \downarrow 0} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{F}_t^2] t^{-1} = 0$;

Then $(\mathbb{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is a $G_{\sigma_2, \bar{\cdot}_1}$ -Brownian motion with $\sigma_2^2 = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{F}_1^2]$ and $\sigma_1^2 = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{F}_1^2]$:

In the sequel, in order to prove Theorem 3.2 we will show that the inf-convolution $\hat{E}_1 \hat{E}_2[\cdot]$ is a sublinear expectation on $(\cdot; H)$. This will make

Lemma 3.4 applicable. More precisely, we will show that under the sublinear expectation $\hat{\mathbb{E}}_1 - \hat{\mathbb{E}}_2[\cdot]$ the canonical process $(B_t)_{t \geq 0}$ satisfies the assumptions of Lemma 3.4 for $\bar{\omega} = \bar{\omega}_1; \bar{\omega}_2$. This has as consequence that $(B_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is a $G_{\bar{\omega}_1, \bar{\omega}_2}$ -Brownian motion under $\hat{\mathbb{E}}_1 - \hat{\mathbb{E}}_2[\cdot]$; and implies that $\hat{\mathbb{E}}_1 - \hat{\mathbb{E}}_2[\cdot] = \hat{\mathbb{E}}_3[\cdot]$:

Proposition 3.5 Under the assumption $[\bar{\omega}_1; \bar{\omega}_1]^T [\bar{\omega}_2; \bar{\omega}_2] = [\bar{\omega}_2; \bar{\omega}_1]$; the inf-convolution $\hat{\mathbb{E}}_1 - \hat{\mathbb{E}}_2[\cdot]$ is a sublinear expectation on $(\cdot; H)$.

Proof: (a) Monotonicity: The monotonicity is an immediate consequence of that of the G -expectation $\hat{\mathbb{E}}_1[\cdot]$:

(b) Preservation of constants: From the preservation of constants property and the subadditivity of $\hat{\mathbb{E}}_1$; we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \hat{\mathbb{E}}_1 - \hat{\mathbb{E}}_2[c] \\ &= \inf_{F \in \mathcal{H}} f\hat{\mathbb{E}}_1[c - F] + \hat{\mathbb{E}}_2[F]g \\ &= c + \inf_{F \in \mathcal{H}} f\hat{\mathbb{E}}_1[-F] + \hat{\mathbb{E}}_2[F]g \\ &= c + \inf_{F \in \mathcal{H}} f\hat{\mathbb{E}}_3[-F] + \hat{\mathbb{E}}_3[F]g \\ &= c: \end{aligned}$$

The latter lines follow from the fact that $\hat{\mathbb{E}}_3 - \hat{\mathbb{E}}_i; i=1,2$; and the subadditivity of $\hat{\mathbb{E}}_3$: Moreover, by taking $F=0$ in the definition of $\hat{\mathbb{E}}_1 - \hat{\mathbb{E}}_2[c]$ we get the converse inequality.

(c) Sub-additivity: Given arbitrary fixed $X, Y \in \mathcal{H}$, in virtue of the subadditivity of $\hat{\mathbb{E}}_1[\cdot]$ and $\hat{\mathbb{E}}_2[\cdot]$, we have for all $F_1, F_2 \in \mathcal{H}$

$$\begin{aligned} & \hat{\mathbb{E}}_1[X - Y - F_1] + \hat{\mathbb{E}}_2[F_1] + \hat{\mathbb{E}}_1[Y - F_2] + \hat{\mathbb{E}}_2[F_2] \\ &= \hat{\mathbb{E}}_1[X - (F_1 + F_2)] + \hat{\mathbb{E}}_2[F_1 + F_2]: \end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} & \hat{\mathbb{E}}_1 - \hat{\mathbb{E}}_2[X - Y] + \hat{\mathbb{E}}_1 - \hat{\mathbb{E}}_2[Y] \\ &= \inf_{F_1, F_2 \in \mathcal{H}} f\hat{\mathbb{E}}_1[X - Y - F_1] + \hat{\mathbb{E}}_2[F_1] + \hat{\mathbb{E}}_1[Y - F_2] + \hat{\mathbb{E}}_2[F_2]g \\ &= \inf_{F_1, F_2 \in \mathcal{H}} f\hat{\mathbb{E}}_1[X - F_1 - F_2] + \hat{\mathbb{E}}_2[F_1 + F_2]g \\ &= \hat{\mathbb{E}}_1 - \hat{\mathbb{E}}_2[X]: \end{aligned}$$

(d) Finally, the positive homogeneity is an easy consequence of that of $\hat{\mathbb{E}}_1[\cdot]$ and $\hat{\mathbb{E}}_2[\cdot]$.

The following series of statements has as objective to prove that the canonical process $(B_t)_{t \geq 0}$ satisfies under the sublinear expectation $\hat{\mathbb{E}}_1 - \hat{\mathbb{E}}_2[\cdot]$ the

assumptions of Lemma 3.4.

Lemma 3.6: Let φ be a convex or concave function such that $\varphi(B_t) \in H$; then $\hat{E}_1 - \hat{E}_2[\varphi(B_t)] = \hat{E}_3[\varphi(B_t)]$:

Proof: We only prove the convex case, the proof for concave φ is analogous. If φ is convex we have according to Proposition 2.7,

$$\hat{E}_3[\varphi(B_t)] = E[\varphi(-W_t)] = \hat{E}_1[\varphi(B_t)]:$$

By Proposition 2.8 we know that $\hat{E}_i[\cdot] = \hat{E}_3[\cdot]; i = 1, 2$; and consequently, also $\hat{E}_1 - \hat{E}_2[\cdot] = \hat{E}_3[\cdot]$:

On the other hand, since obviously, $\hat{E}_1 - \hat{E}_2[\cdot] = \hat{E}_1[\cdot]$; we get, for convex functions φ , $\hat{E}_1 - \hat{E}_2[\varphi(B_t)] = \hat{E}_3[\varphi(B_t)]$: Similarly we can prove the concave case.

Remark: From Proposition 3.5 we know already that $\hat{E}_1 - \hat{E}_2[\cdot]$ is a sub-linear expectation. This implies $\hat{E}_1 - \hat{E}_2[0] = 0$. From Lemma 3.6, we have that $F = 0$ is an optimal control when φ is convex, while the optimal control is $F = \varphi(B_t)$ when φ is concave. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{E}_1 - \hat{E}_2[B_t] &= \hat{E}_1 - \hat{E}_2[B_t] = 0 \\ \hat{E}_1 - \hat{E}_2[B_t^2] &= -\frac{1}{2}t; \hat{E}_1 - \hat{E}_2[B_t^3] = -\frac{3}{2}t: \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 3.7: We have $\frac{\hat{E}_1 - \hat{E}_2[B_t^3]}{t} \rightarrow 0$; as $t \rightarrow 0$:

Proof: Since $\varphi(x) = x^3$ is convex, we obtain due to Lemma 3.6 that:

$$\hat{E}_1 - \hat{E}_2[B_t^3] = \hat{E}_3[B_t^3] = -\frac{3}{2}E[W_1^3]t^{3/2};$$

where $(W_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is Brownian motion under the linear expectation E . The statement follows now easily.

Proposition 3.8: We have

$$\hat{E}_1 - \hat{E}_2[\varphi(B_t - B_s)] = \hat{E}_1 - \hat{E}_2[\varphi(B_{t-s})]; t \geq s \geq 0; \varphi \in C_{lip}(\mathbb{R}):$$

The proof of Proposition 3.8 is rather technical. To improve the readability of the paper, the proof is postponed to the annex.

Lemma 3.9: For each $t \geq s$, $B_t - B_s$ is independent of $(B_{t_1}; B_{t_2}; \dots; B_{t_n})$ under the sub-linear expectation $\hat{E}_1 - \hat{E}_2[\cdot]$, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}; 0 \leq t_1 \leq \dots \leq t_n \leq s$, that is, for all $\varphi \in C_{lip}(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})$

$$\begin{aligned} & \hat{E}_1 - \hat{E}_2[\varphi(B_{t_1}; B_{t_2}; \dots; B_{t_n}; B_t - B_s)] \\ &= \hat{E}_1 - \hat{E}_2[\hat{E}_1 - \hat{E}_2[\varphi(x_1; \dots; x_n; B_t - B_s)] |_{(x_1, \dots, x_n) = (B_{t_1}, \dots, B_{t_n})}]: \end{aligned}$$

We shift also the proof of Lemma 3.9 to the annex.

We are now able to give the proof of Theorem 3.2:

Proof (of Theorem 3.2): It is sufficient to apply Lemma 3.4. Due to the above statements, we know that the canonical process $(B_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is a G -Brownian motion under the sublinear expectation $\hat{\mathbb{E}}_1 \hat{\mathbb{E}}_2[\cdot]$. Consequently $\hat{\mathbb{E}}_1 \hat{\mathbb{E}}_2[\cdot]$ is a G -expectation on the space $(\cdot; H)$ and has the driver $G_1 \# G_2 = G_{-2, -1}$:

Given n sublinear expectations $\hat{\mathbb{E}}_1, \dots, \hat{\mathbb{E}}_n$ we define iteratively

$$\hat{\mathbb{E}}_1 \hat{\mathbb{E}}_2 \hat{\mathbb{E}}_3 := (\hat{\mathbb{E}}_1 \hat{\mathbb{E}}_2) \hat{\mathbb{E}}_3;$$

and

$$\hat{\mathbb{E}}_1 \hat{\mathbb{E}}_2 \dots \hat{\mathbb{E}}_k := (\hat{\mathbb{E}}_1 \hat{\mathbb{E}}_2 \dots \hat{\mathbb{E}}_{k-1}) \hat{\mathbb{E}}_k; \quad 3 \leq k \leq n:$$

Then from Theorem 3.2 it follows:

Corollary 3.10: Let $0 \leq \gamma_i \leq 1; 1 \leq i \leq n$; and denote by $\hat{\mathbb{E}}_i[\cdot]$ the $G_{\gamma_i, -\gamma_i}$ -expectation on the space $(\cdot; H)$. Then under the assumption $\bigcap_{i=1}^n [\gamma_i, -\gamma_i] \neq \emptyset$; $\hat{\mathbb{E}}_1 \hat{\mathbb{E}}_2 \dots \hat{\mathbb{E}}_n[\cdot]$ also is a G -expectation and has the driver $G_{-\gamma_1, -\gamma_1} \# G_{-\gamma_2, -\gamma_2} \dots \# G_{-\gamma_n, -\gamma_n}$. Moreover, for any permutation i_1, \dots, i_n of the natural numbers $1, \dots, n$ it holds:

$$\hat{\mathbb{E}}_1 \hat{\mathbb{E}}_2 \dots \hat{\mathbb{E}}_n[\cdot] = \hat{\mathbb{E}}_{i_1} \hat{\mathbb{E}}_{i_2} \dots \hat{\mathbb{E}}_{i_n}[\cdot]:$$

Remark: If $\bigcap_{i=1}^n [\gamma_i, -\gamma_i]$ is empty, then $\hat{\mathbb{E}}_1 \hat{\mathbb{E}}_2 \dots \hat{\mathbb{E}}_n[\cdot] = 1$, otherwise $\hat{\mathbb{E}}_1 \hat{\mathbb{E}}_2 \dots \hat{\mathbb{E}}_n[\cdot]$ is a $G_{\bar{\gamma}, -\bar{\gamma}}$ -expectation, where $[\bar{\gamma}, -\bar{\gamma}] = \bigcap_{i=1}^n [\gamma_i, -\gamma_i]$.

4 Annex

4.1 Proof of Proposition 3.8

We begin with the proof of Proposition 3.8. For this we need the following two lemmas.

Lemma 4.1: For all $T > 0$ and all $X \in H_T$; we have

$$\inf_{F \in H_T} f \hat{\mathbb{E}}_1[X - F] + \hat{\mathbb{E}}_2[F] g = \inf_{F \in H} f \hat{\mathbb{E}}_1[X - F] + \hat{\mathbb{E}}_2[F] g:$$

Proof: From $H_T \subset H$ we see that

$$\inf_{F \in H_T} f\hat{E}_1[X - F] + \hat{E}_2[F] \leq \inf_{F \in H} f\hat{E}_1[X - F] + \hat{E}_2[F].$$

Thus it remains to prove the converse inequality.

First we notice that, due to Proposition 2.8 and the subadditivity of \hat{E}_3 , for any $F \in H$,

$$\hat{E}_2[F \chi_T] + \hat{E}_1[-F \chi_T] \leq \hat{E}_3[F \chi_T] + \hat{E}_3[-F \chi_T] = 0.$$

Consequently, for all $X \in H_T$ and all $F \in H$;

$$\begin{aligned} & \hat{E}_1[X - F] + \hat{E}_2[F] \\ &= \hat{E}_1[\hat{E}_1[X - F \chi_T] + \hat{E}_2[F]] \\ &= \hat{E}_1[X] + \hat{E}_1[-F \chi_T] + \hat{E}_2[F] \\ &= \hat{E}_1[X - (\hat{E}_1[-F \chi_T])] + \hat{E}_2[\hat{E}_1[-F \chi_T]] \\ & \quad + \hat{E}_2[\hat{E}_1[-F \chi_T] + \hat{E}_2[F \chi_T]] \\ &= \hat{E}_1[X - (\hat{E}_1[-F \chi_T])] + \hat{E}_2[\hat{E}_1[-F \chi_T]] \\ & \quad + \inf_{F \in H_T} f\hat{E}_1[X - F] + \hat{E}_2[F]. \end{aligned}$$

The statement now follows easily.

Lemma 4.2: For all $X \in H_t^s; 0 \leq t$; the following holds true:

$$\inf_{F \in H_t} f\hat{E}_1[X - F] + \hat{E}_2[F] = \inf_{F \in H_t^s} f\hat{E}_1[X - F] + \hat{E}_2[F].$$

Proof: Firstly, from $H_t^s \subset H_t$, we have, obviously, for all $X \in H_t^s$;

$$\inf_{F \in H_t} f\hat{E}_1[X - F] + \hat{E}_2[F] \leq \inf_{F \in H_t^s} f\hat{E}_1[X - F] + \hat{E}_2[F].$$

Secondly, for any $X \in H_t^s$ and $F \in H_t$, we can suppose without loss of generality that $X = (B_{t_1} - B_s; \dots; B_{t_n} - B_s)$ and $F = (B_{t_1}^0; B_{t_2}^0; \dots; B_{t_k}^0; B_{t_1} - B_s; \dots; B_{t_n} - B_s)$; where $t_1^0, \dots, t_k^0 \in [0, s]$; $t_1, \dots, t_n \in [s, t]$; $n, k \in \mathbb{N}$; $' \in C_{\text{lip}}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $\cdot \in C_{\text{lip}}(\mathbb{R}^{n+k})$.

To simplify the notation we put:

$$Y_1 = (B_{t_1}^0; B_{t_2}^0; \dots; B_{t_k}^0); Y_2 = (B_{t_1} - B_s; \dots; B_{t_n} - B_s); x = (x_1; x_2; \dots; x_k);$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \hat{E}_1[X \mid \mathcal{F}] + \hat{E}_2[\mathbb{F}] \\
&= \hat{E}_1[\hat{E}_1[\mathbb{F} \mid (Y_2) \mid (Y_1; Y_2) \mathcal{H}_s]] + \hat{E}_2[\mathbb{F}] \\
&= \hat{E}_1[\hat{E}_1[\mathbb{F} \mid (Y_2) \mid (\mathbf{x}; Y_2)]_{j_{k=Y_1}}] + \hat{E}_2[\mathbb{F}] \\
&= \hat{E}_1[\hat{E}_1[\mathbb{F} \mid (Y_2) \mid (\mathbf{x}; Y_2)] + \hat{E}_2[\mathbb{F} \mid (\mathbf{x}; Y_2)] \mid \hat{E}_2[\mathbb{F} \mid (\mathbf{x}; Y_2)]_{j_{k=Y_1}}] + \hat{E}_2[\mathbb{F}] \\
&= \hat{E}_1[\inf_{\mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{H}_t^s} \hat{E}_1[X \mid \mathcal{F}] + \hat{E}_2[\mathbb{F} \mid \mathcal{G} \mid \hat{E}_2[\mathbb{F} \mid (\mathbf{x}; Y_2)]_{j_{k=Y_1}}] + \hat{E}_2[\mathbb{F}]] \\
&= \inf_{\mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{H}_t^s} \hat{E}_1[X \mid \mathcal{F}] + \hat{E}_2[\mathbb{F} \mid \mathcal{G}] + \hat{E}_1[\hat{E}_2[\mathbb{F} \mid (\mathbf{x}; Y_2)]_{j_{k=Y_1}}] \\
&\quad + \hat{E}_2[\hat{E}_2[\mathbb{F} \mid (\mathbf{x}; Y_2)]_{j_{k=Y_1}}] \\
&= \inf_{\mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{H}_t^s} \hat{E}_1[X \mid \mathcal{F}] + \hat{E}_2[\mathbb{F} \mid \mathcal{G}]:
\end{aligned}$$

Thus the proof is complete now .

Now we are able to prove Proposition 3.8.

Proof (of Proposition 3.8): For arbitrarily fixed $s \geq 0$, we put $\mathcal{B}_t = \mathcal{B}_{t+s} \mid \mathcal{B}_s$; $t \geq 0$: Then, obviously, $\mathcal{H}_{t+s}^s = \mathcal{H}_t$, $t \geq 0$; where \mathcal{H}_t is generated by \mathcal{B}_t . Moreover, \mathcal{B}_t is a Gaussian Motion under \hat{E}_1 and \hat{E}_2 : According to the Lemmas 4.1 and 4.2, we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \hat{E}_1[\hat{E}_2[\mathbb{F} \mid (\mathcal{B}_t \mid \mathcal{B}_s)]] \\
&= \inf_{\mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{H}_t^s} \hat{E}_1[\mathbb{F} \mid (\mathcal{B}_t \mid \mathcal{B}_s) \mid \mathcal{F}] + \hat{E}_2[\mathbb{F} \mid \mathcal{G}] \\
&= \inf_{\mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{t+s}} \hat{E}_1[\mathbb{F} \mid (\mathcal{B}_{t+s}) \mid \mathcal{F}] + \hat{E}_2[\mathbb{F} \mid \mathcal{G}] \\
&= \inf_{\mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{t+s}} \hat{E}_1[\mathbb{F} \mid (\mathcal{B}_{t+s}) \mid \mathcal{F}] + \hat{E}_2[\mathbb{F} \mid \mathcal{G}] \\
&= \hat{E}_1[\hat{E}_2[\mathbb{F} \mid (\mathcal{B}_{t+s})]]:
\end{aligned}$$

Thus the proof of Proposition 3.8 is complete now .

4.2 Proof of Lemma 3.9

Let us come now to the proof of Lemma 3.9, which we split into a sequel of lemmas.

Lemma 4.3: For all $\mathbf{x}' \in C_{\text{Lip}}(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})$; $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $0 \leq t_1, \dots, t_n \leq s \leq t$; it holds:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \hat{E}_1[\hat{E}_2[\mathbb{F} \mid (\mathcal{B}_{t_1}; \mathcal{B}_{t_2}; \dots; \mathcal{B}_{t_n}; \mathcal{B}_t \mid \mathcal{B}_s)]] \\
&= \hat{E}_1[\hat{E}_2[\hat{E}_1[\hat{E}_2[\mathbb{F} \mid (\mathbf{x}_1; \dots; \mathbf{x}_n; \mathcal{B}_t \mid \mathcal{B}_s)]_{(x_1, \dots, x_n) = (\mathcal{B}_{t_1}, \dots, \mathcal{B}_{t_n})}]]]:
\end{aligned}$$

Proof: Let $X = (B_{t_1}; B_{t_2}; \dots; B_{t_n}; B_t - B_s)$. Without loss of generality we can suppose that $F \in H$ has the form $(B_{t_1}^0; B_{t_2}^0; \dots; B_{t_k}^0; B_{t_{k+1}}^0; \dots; B_{t_m}^0 - B_s)$; where $0 \leq t_1 \leq \dots \leq t_n \leq t_1^0 \leq \dots \leq t_k^0 \leq s \leq t_{k+1}^0 \leq \dots \leq t_m^0 \leq s; m \leq k; k \leq N$; and $\gamma \in C_{Lip}(\mathbb{R}^{n+1}); \gamma \in C_{Lip}(\mathbb{R}^m)$:

For simplifying the notation we put:

$$\begin{aligned} x_1 &= (x_1; \dots; x_n); x_2 = (x_1^0; \dots; x_k^0); Y_1 = (B_{t_1}; B_{t_2}; \dots; B_{t_n}); \\ Y_2 &= (B_{t_1}^0; \dots; B_{t_k}^0); Y_3 = (B_{t_{k+1}}^0 - B_s; \dots; B_{t_m}^0 - B_s): \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \hat{E}_1[X - F] + \hat{E}_2[F] = \hat{E}_1[\hat{E}_1[X - F | \mathcal{H}_s]] + \hat{E}_2[\hat{E}_2[F | \mathcal{H}_s]] \\ &= \hat{E}_1[\hat{E}_1[(x_1; B_t - B_s) - (x_2; Y_3)]_{k_1=Y_1, k_2=Y_2}] \\ & \quad + \hat{E}_2[\hat{E}_2[(x_2; Y_3)]_{k_2=Y_2}] \\ &= \hat{E}_1[\hat{E}_1[(x_1; B_t - B_s) - (x_2; Y_3)] + \hat{E}_2[(x_2; Y_3)] \\ & \quad \hat{E}_2[(x_2; Y_3)]_{k_1=Y_1, k_2=Y_2}] + \hat{E}_2[\hat{E}_2[(x_2; Y_3)]_{k_2=Y_2}] \\ & \quad \hat{E}_1[\hat{E}_1 - \hat{E}_2[(x_1; B_t - B_s)] - \hat{E}_2[(x_2; Y_3)]_{k_1=Y_1, k_2=Y_2}] \\ & \quad + \hat{E}_2[\hat{E}_2[(x_2; Y_3)]_{k_2=Y_2}] \\ &= \hat{E}_1 - \hat{E}_2[\hat{E}_1 - \hat{E}_2[(x_1; \dots; x_n; B_t - B_s)]_{(x_1, \dots, x_n) = (B_{t_1}, \dots, B_{t_n})}]: \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \hat{E}_1 - \hat{E}_2[(B_{t_1}; B_{t_2}; \dots; B_{t_n}; B_t - B_s)] \\ & \hat{E}_1 - \hat{E}_2[\hat{E}_1 - \hat{E}_2[(x_1; \dots; x_n; B_t - B_s)]_{(x_1, \dots, x_n) = (B_{t_1}, \dots, B_{t_n})}]: \end{aligned}$$

The proof of the Lemma 4.3 is complete now.

Let $Lip(\mathbb{R}^n); n \leq N$; denote the space of bounded Lipschitz functions $\gamma \in Lip(\mathbb{R}^n)$ satisfying:

$$|\gamma(x) - \gamma(y)| \leq C \|x - y\|, \quad x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n;$$

where C is a constant only depending on γ .

The proof that

$$\begin{aligned} & \hat{E}_1 - \hat{E}_2[(B_{t_1}; B_{t_2}; \dots; B_{t_n}; B_t - B_s)] \\ & \hat{E}_1 - \hat{E}_2[\hat{E}_1 - \hat{E}_2[(x_1; \dots; x_n; B_t - B_s)]_{(x_1, \dots, x_n) = (B_{t_1}, \dots, B_{t_n})}] \end{aligned}$$

is much more difficult than that of the converse inequality. For the proof we need the following statements.

Lemma 4.4: We assume that the random variable $'(B_{t_1}; B_{t_2} \dots B_{t_n})$, with $t_i \leq t_{i+1}; i = 1; \dots; n-1; n \geq 2$ and $' \in Lip(\mathbb{R}^n)$; satisfies the following assumption: there exist $L, M \geq 0$ s.t. $|'| \leq L$, and $'(x; y) = 0$, for all $(x; y) \in [M; M]^c \subset \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$:

We define

$$\begin{aligned} (x) &:= \hat{E}_1 \hat{E}_2 ['(x; B_{t_2} \dots B_{t_n})] \\ &= \inf_{F \in \mathcal{H}_{t_n}^{t_1}} \hat{E}_1 ['(x; B_{t_2} \dots B_{t_n}) | F] + \hat{E}_2 [F] g. \end{aligned}$$

Then we have the existence of an ϵ -optimal $e(x)$ of the form $(x; B_{t_2}^0 \dots B_{t_{i+1}}^0 \dots B_{t_n})$, i.e., for any $\epsilon > 0$ we can find a finite dimensional function $(x; \cdot) \in G_{Lip}(\mathbb{R}^1); 1 \leq i \leq n$; such that, for suitable $t_2^0; \dots; t_{i+1}^0 \leq t_1$,

$$\begin{aligned} e(x) &= \hat{E}_1 ['(x; B_{t_2} \dots B_{t_n})] \\ &\quad (x; B_{t_2}^0 \dots B_{t_{i+1}}^0 \dots B_{t_n})] \\ &\quad + \hat{E}_2 [(x; B_{t_2}^0 \dots B_{t_{i+1}}^0 \dots B_{t_n})] \end{aligned}$$

satisfies

$$|e(x) - (x)| \leq \epsilon:$$

Proof: Since $' \in Lip(\mathbb{R}^n)$, we find for any $\epsilon > 0$ some sufficiently large $J \geq 1$ s.t. for all $x, x' \in \mathbb{R}$ with $|x - x'| \leq \frac{2M}{J}$ it holds $|'(x; y) - '(x'; y)| \leq \epsilon$. We then let $M = x_0 \leq x_1 \leq \dots \leq x_J = M$; be such that $x_{j+1} - x_j = \frac{2M}{J}; 0 \leq j \leq J-1$:

On the other hand, for every fixed j there are some $m_j \geq 1, t_{i,j} \leq t_1$ ($2 \leq i \leq m_j$) and $x_j \in C_{Lip}(\mathbb{R}^{m_j-1})$; such that

$$\begin{aligned} (x_j) &= \hat{E}_1 ['(x_j; B_{t_2} \dots B_{t_n})] \\ &\quad (x_j; B_{t_{2,j}} \dots B_{t_{m_j,j}} \dots B_{t_n})] \\ &\quad + \hat{E}_2 [(x_j; B_{t_{2,j}} \dots B_{t_{m_j,j}} \dots B_{t_n})] \\ &= (x_j) + \epsilon: \end{aligned}$$

Since there are only a finite number of j we can find a finite dimensional function denoted by $(x_j; y); y \in \mathbb{R}^1$; s.t. for each fixed $j, (x_j; \cdot) \in C_{Lip}(\mathbb{R}^1)$ and

$$(x_j; B_{t_2}^0 \dots B_{t_{i+1}}^0 \dots B_{t_n}) = (x_j; B_{t_{2,j}} \dots B_{t_{m_j,j}} \dots B_{t_n});$$

where $f_{t_2^0; \dots; t_{i+1}^0} g = \sum_{j=1}^J f_{t_{2,j}; \dots; t_{m_j,j}} g$.

With the convention $(x_0; y) = (x_J; y) = 0; y \in \mathbb{R}^1$; we define

$$(x; y) = \begin{cases} \sum_{j=0}^{J-1} \frac{x_{j+1} - x_j}{x_{j+1} - x_j} (x_j; y) + \frac{x - x_J}{x_{j+1} - x_j} (x_{j+1}; y); & x \in [x_j, x_{j+1}); \\ 0, & \text{otherwise:} \end{cases}$$

Obviously, $(x; y) \in C_{\text{lip}}(\mathbb{R}^{1+1})$.

We now introduce $e(x)$:

$$= \hat{E}_1[\mathbb{I}(x; B_{t_2} \dots B_{t_1}; \dots; B_{t_n} \dots B_{t_{n-1}}) (x; B_{t_2}^0 \dots B_{t_1}; \dots; B_{t_{1+1}}^0 \dots B_{t_1})] \\ + \hat{E}_2[\mathbb{I}(x; B_{t_2}^0 \dots B_{t_1}; \dots; B_{t_{1+1}}^0 \dots B_{t_1})]:$$

If $x \notin [M; M]$; $\mathbb{I}(x; \cdot) = 0$ and $(x; \cdot) = 0$: Consequently, $e(x) = 0$: Moreover, from Proposition 3.5 we have that for $x \in [M; M]$ also $(x) = 0$: Then $e(x) = (x) = 0$ when $x \in [M; M]$; and we have also $j^e(x_j) = (x_j)_j = 0$ for each j . We also recall that, for all $0 \leq j \leq J-1$ and all $x \in [x_j, x_{j+1})$;

$$j(x; y) = (x_j; y)_j = 0; \text{ for all } y \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}:$$

Our objective is to estimate

$$j^e(x) = (x)_j = j^e(x) = (x_j)_j + j(x_j) = (x)_j:$$

For this end we notice that, with the notation:

$$Y_1 = (B_{t_2} \dots B_{t_1}; \dots; B_{t_n} \dots B_{t_{n-1}}); Y_2 = (B_{t_2}^0 \dots B_{t_1}; \dots; B_{t_{1+1}}^0 \dots B_{t_1});$$

we have from the definition of (x) and (x_j) and from the properties of \hat{E}_1, \hat{E}_2 as sublinear expectation:

$$j(x) = (x_j)_j = \hat{E}_1 \hat{E}_2[\mathbb{I}(x; Y_1) = (x_j; Y_1)_j] = 0:$$

On the other hand, since $j(x; Y_1) = (x_j; Y_1)_j = 0$;

$$j^e(x) = (x_j)_j \\ = \hat{E}_1[\mathbb{I}(x; Y_1) = (x; Y_2)] + \hat{E}_2[\mathbb{I}(x; Y_2)] = (x_j)_j \\ j\hat{E}_1[\mathbb{I}(x_j; Y_1) = (x; Y_2)] + \hat{E}_2[\mathbb{I}(x; Y_2)] = (x_j)_j + 0 = 0:$$

Due to the definition of (x_j) , the latter expression without module is non-negative. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
& j^e(x) - (x_j)j \\
& \hat{E}_1[\varphi(x_j; Y_1) - \varphi(x_j; Y_2)] + \hat{E}_2[\varphi(x_j; Y_2)] - (x_j) + \epsilon = 6 \\
& \hat{E}_1\left[\frac{x_{j+1} - x}{x_{j+1} - x_j}(\varphi(x_j; Y_1) - \varphi(x_j; Y_2)) + \frac{x - x_j}{x_{j+1} - x_j}(\varphi(x_{j+1}; Y_1) \right. \\
& \quad \left. - \varphi(x_{j+1}; Y_2))\right] + \hat{E}_2\left[\frac{x_{j+1} - x}{x_{j+1} - x_j}(\varphi(x_j; Y_2) + \frac{x - x_j}{x_{j+1} - x_j}(\varphi(x_{j+1}; Y_2))\right] \\
& \quad - (x_j) + 2\epsilon = 6 \\
& \frac{x_{j+1} - x}{x_{j+1} - x_j} \hat{E}_1[\varphi(x_j; Y_1) - \varphi(x_j; Y_2)] + \hat{E}_2[\varphi(x_j; Y_2)] - (x_j)g \\
& + \frac{x - x_j}{x_{j+1} - x_j} \hat{E}_1[\varphi(x_{j+1}; Y_1) - \varphi(x_{j+1}; Y_2)] + \hat{E}_2[\varphi(x_{j+1}; Y_2)] - (x_j)g \\
& + 2\epsilon = 6:
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, due to the choice of x_j and x_{j+1} ,

$$j^e(x) - (x_j)j - 5\epsilon = 6:$$

This latter estimate combined with the fact that for $j(x) - (x_j)j - \epsilon = 6$ then yields

$$j^e(x) - (x)j - \epsilon:$$

The proof of Lemma 4.4 is complete now.

Lemma 4.4 allows to prove the following:

Lemma 4.5: Let $\varphi \in \text{Lip}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ be bounded and such that, for some real $M > 0$; $\text{supp}(\varphi) \subset [M, M] \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$: Then, for all $0 = t_1 < t_2 < \dots < t_n$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \hat{E}_1 - \hat{E}_2[\varphi(B_{t_1}; B_{t_2} - B_{t_1}; \dots; B_{t_n} - B_{t_{n-1}})] \\
& = \hat{E}_1 - \hat{E}_2[\hat{E}_1 - \hat{E}_2[\varphi(x; B_{t_2} - B_{t_1}; \dots; B_{t_n} - B_{t_{n-1}})] | \mathcal{F}_{B_{t_1}}]]:
\end{aligned}$$

Proof: Firstly, it follows directly from Lemma 4.3 that:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \hat{E}_1 - \hat{E}_2[\varphi(B_{t_1}; B_{t_2} - B_{t_1}; \dots; B_{t_n} - B_{t_{n-1}})] \\
& \hat{E}_1 - \hat{E}_2[\hat{E}_1 - \hat{E}_2[\varphi(x; B_{t_2} - B_{t_1}; \dots; B_{t_n} - B_{t_{n-1}})] | \mathcal{F}_{B_{t_1}}]]: \quad (1)
\end{aligned}$$

Secondly, from Lemma 4.4 we know that for any $\epsilon > 0$ there is some $\delta \in C_{\text{Lip}}(\mathbb{R}^{1+1})$ such that $j^e(x) - (x)j - \epsilon$; for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$; where $e(x)$ and (x) have been introduced in Lemma 4.4.

Due to Lemma 4.1, there is $e(B_{t_1}^{(0)}; \dots; B_{t_k}^{(0)}) \in H_{t_1}; 0 = t_1^{(0)}; \dots; t_k^{(0)} = t_1; k \in \mathbb{N}$, such that

$$\hat{E}_1[\varphi(B_{t_1}) - e(B_{t_1}^{(0)}; \dots; B_{t_k}^{(0)})] + \hat{E}_2[\varphi(B_{t_1}^{(0)}; \dots; B_{t_k}^{(0)})] - \hat{E}_1 - \hat{E}_2[\varphi(B_{t_1})]j - \epsilon:$$

For $t_2^0; \dots; t_{l+1}^0 = t_1$ from the definition of $e(x)$ in Lemma 4.4 we put

$$^0(x) = \hat{E}_2[(x; B_{t_2^0} \dots B_{t_1}; \dots; B_{t_{l+1}^0} \dots B_{t_1})]$$

and

$$F = (B_{t_1}; B_{t_2^0} \dots B_{t_1}; \dots; B_{t_{l+1}^0} \dots B_{t_1}) + e(B_{t_1^0}; \dots; B_{t_k^0})^0(B_{t_1}):$$

Notice that

$$\hat{E}_2[F \mathcal{H}_{t_1}] = e(B_{t_1^0}; \dots; B_{t_k^0})$$

and

$$\hat{E}_1[(B_{t_1}; B_{t_2} \dots B_{t_1}; \dots; B_{t_n} \dots B_{t_{n-1}}) \cdot F \mathcal{H}_{t_1}] = e(B_{t_1}) \cdot e(B_{t_1^0}; \dots; B_{t_k^0}):$$

Then, due to the choice of $e(B_{t_1^0}; \dots; B_{t_k^0})$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \hat{E}_1 \hat{E}_2[(B_{t_1}; B_{t_2} \dots B_{t_1}; \dots; B_{t_n} \dots B_{t_{n-1}})] \hat{E}_1 \hat{E}_2[(B_{t_1})] \\ & \hat{E}_1[(B_{t_1}; B_{t_2} \dots B_{t_1}; \dots; B_{t_n} \dots B_{t_{n-1}}) \cdot F] + \hat{E}_2 \hat{E}_2[F \mathcal{H}_{t_1}] \\ & (\hat{E}_1[(B_{t_1}) \cdot e(B_{t_1^0}; \dots; B_{t_k^0})] + \hat{E}_2[e(B_{t_1^0}; \dots; B_{t_k^0})]) + " \\ & = \hat{E}_1[(B_{t_1}; B_{t_2} \dots B_{t_1}; \dots; B_{t_n} \dots B_{t_{n-1}}) \cdot F] \\ & \hat{E}_1[(B_{t_1}) \cdot e(B_{t_1^0}; \dots; B_{t_k^0})] + " \\ & = \hat{E}_1 \hat{E}_1[(B_{t_1}; B_{t_2} \dots B_{t_1}; \dots; B_{t_n} \dots B_{t_{n-1}}) \cdot F \mathcal{H}_{t_1}] \\ & \hat{E}_1[(B_{t_1}) \cdot e(B_{t_1^0}; \dots; B_{t_k^0})] + " \\ & = \hat{E}_1[e(B_{t_1}) \cdot e(B_{t_1^0}; \dots; B_{t_k^0})] \hat{E}_1[(B_{t_1}) \cdot e(B_{t_1^0}; \dots; B_{t_k^0})] + " \\ & \hat{E}_1[(B_{t_1}) \cdot e(B_{t_1})] + " \\ & 2": \end{aligned}$$

From the definition of e in Lemma 4.4 and the arbitrariness of $" > 0$ it follows then that

$$\begin{aligned} & \hat{E}_1 \hat{E}_2[(B_{t_1}; B_{t_2} \dots B_{t_1}; \dots; B_{t_n} \dots B_{t_{n-1}})] \\ & \hat{E}_1 \hat{E}_2 \hat{E}_1 \hat{E}_2[(x; B_{t_2} \dots B_{t_1}; \dots; B_{t_n} \dots B_{t_{n-1}})]_{x=B_{t_1}}]: \end{aligned}$$

This together with (1) yields the wished statement. The proof of Lemma 4.5 is complete now.

In the next statement we extend Lemma 4.5 to general functions of $\text{Lip}(\mathbb{R}^n)$:

Lemma 4.6: Let $f \in \text{Lip}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $n \geq 1$; and $t_n = t_{n-1} = \dots = t_1 = 0$: Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \hat{E}_1 \hat{E}_2[(B_{t_1}; B_{t_2} \dots B_{t_1}; \dots; B_{t_n} \dots B_{t_{n-1}})] \\ & = \hat{E}_1 \hat{E}_2 \hat{E}_1 \hat{E}_2[(x; B_{t_2} \dots B_{t_1}; \dots; B_{t_n} \dots B_{t_{n-1}})]_{x=B_{t_1}}]: \end{aligned}$$

Proof: Let $L > 0$ be such that $\|j\|_L \leq L$: Given an arbitrarily large $M > 0$ we define, for all $y \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$,

$$e(x; y) := \begin{cases} \sum_{j=1}^8 \rho_j(x; y); & x \in [M; M] \\ \rho_1(M; y)(M+1+x); & x \in [M-1; M] \\ \rho_1(M; y)(M+1-x); & x \in [M; M+1] \\ 0; & \text{otherwise:} \end{cases}$$

Obviously, e satisfies the assumptions of Lemma 4.5.

Letting

$$e^0(x) = \hat{E}_1 \hat{E}_2 [e(x; B_{t_2} - B_{t_1}; \dots; B_{t_n} - B_{t_{n-1}})]$$

and

$$j(x) = \hat{E}_1 \hat{E}_2 [\rho_j(x; B_{t_2} - B_{t_1}; \dots; B_{t_n} - B_{t_{n-1}})];$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|j(x) - e^0(x)\| &= \|\hat{E}_1 \hat{E}_2 [\rho_j(x; B_{t_2} - B_{t_1}; \dots; B_{t_n} - B_{t_{n-1}})] \\ &\quad - \hat{E}_1 \hat{E}_2 [e(x; B_{t_2} - B_{t_1}; \dots; B_{t_n} - B_{t_{n-1}})]\| \\ &\leq \hat{E}_1 \hat{E}_2 [\| \rho_j(x; B_{t_2} - B_{t_1}; \dots; B_{t_n} - B_{t_{n-1}}) \\ &\quad - e(x; B_{t_2} - B_{t_1}; \dots; B_{t_n} - B_{t_{n-1}}) \|] \\ &\leq \frac{2L}{M} \|j\|. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{E}_1 \hat{E}_2 [j(B_{t_1})] - \hat{E}_1 \hat{E}_2 [e^0(B_{t_1})]\| &\leq \hat{E}_1 \hat{E}_2 [\|j(B_{t_1}) - e^0(B_{t_1})\|] \\ \hat{E}_1 \hat{E}_2 [\frac{2L}{M} \|j(B_{t_1})\|] &= \frac{2L}{M} \hat{E}_1 \hat{E}_2 [\|j(B_{t_1})\|]. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, from the definition of e we also obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{E}_1 \hat{E}_2 [\rho_j(B_{t_1}; B_{t_2} - B_{t_1}; \dots; B_{t_n} - B_{t_{n-1}})] \\ - \hat{E}_1 \hat{E}_2 [e(B_{t_1}; B_{t_2} - B_{t_1}; \dots; B_{t_n} - B_{t_{n-1}})]\| \\ \leq \hat{E}_1 \hat{E}_2 [\| \rho_j(B_{t_1}; B_{t_2} - B_{t_1}; \dots; B_{t_n} - B_{t_{n-1}}) \\ - e(B_{t_1}; B_{t_2} - B_{t_1}; \dots; B_{t_n} - B_{t_{n-1}}) \|] \\ \leq \frac{2L}{M} \hat{E}_1 \hat{E}_2 [\|j(B_{t_1})\|]. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, since due to Lemma 4.5

$$\hat{E}_1 \hat{E}_2 [e(B_{t_1}; B_{t_2} - B_{t_1}; \dots; B_{t_n} - B_{t_{n-1}})] = \hat{E}_1 \hat{E}_2 [e^0(B_{t_1})];$$

we get by letting $M = \lceil \frac{1}{\epsilon} \rceil + 1$ the relation

$$\begin{aligned} & \hat{E}_1 \hat{E}_2 [\ell(B_{t_1}; B_{t_2} \dots B_{t_1}; \dots; B_{t_n} \dots B_{t_{n-1}})] \\ &= \hat{E}_1 \hat{E}_2 [\hat{E}_1 \hat{E}_2 [\ell(x; B_{t_2} \dots B_{t_1}; \dots; B_{t_n} \dots B_{t_{n-1}})]_{k=B_{t_1}}] : \end{aligned}$$

The proof of Lemma 4.6 is complete.

Lemma 4.7: For all $\ell \in \text{Lip}(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})$; $n \geq 1$; and $0 \leq t_1 \leq t_2 \leq \dots \leq t_n$; we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \hat{E}_1 \hat{E}_2 [\ell(B_{t_2} \dots B_{t_1}; \dots; B_{t_n} \dots B_{t_{n-1}})] \\ &= \hat{E}_1 \hat{E}_2 [\hat{E}_1 \hat{E}_2 [\ell(y; B_{t_3} \dots B_{t_2}; \dots; B_{t_n} \dots B_{t_{n-1}})]_{y=B_{t_2} \dots B_{t_1}}] \end{aligned}$$

Proof: Lemma 4.2 allows to repeat the arguments of the Lemma 4.3 to 4.6 in $H_{t_1}^{t_n}$: The result of Lemma 4.7 then follows.

Finally, we have:

Lemma 4.8: Let $\ell \in \text{Lip}(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})$; $n \geq 1$ and $0 \leq t_1 \leq \dots \leq t_n$: Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \hat{E}_1 \hat{E}_2 [\ell(B_{t_1}; B_{t_2}; \dots; B_{t_n}; B_t \dots B_s)] \\ &= \hat{E}_1 \hat{E}_2 [\hat{E}_1 \hat{E}_2 [\ell(x_1; \dots; x_n; B_t \dots B_s)]_{(x_1; \dots; x_n) = (B_{t_1}; B_{t_2}; \dots; B_{t_n})}] : \end{aligned}$$

Proof: Without any loss of generality we can suppose $0 \leq t_1 \leq t_2 \leq \dots \leq t_n$: Then there is some $\ell \in \text{Lip}(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})$ such that $\ell(B_{t_1}; B_{t_2}; \dots; B_{t_n}; B_t \dots B_s) = \ell(B_{t_1}; B_{t_2} \dots B_{t_1}; \dots; B_{t_n} \dots B_{t_{n-1}}; B_t \dots B_s) \in H_t$: With the notation $x = (x_1; \dots; x_n)$; and due to the Lemma 4.1 to 4.7 we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \hat{E}_1 \hat{E}_2 [\ell(B_{t_1}; B_{t_2}; \dots; B_{t_n}; B_t \dots B_s)] \\ &= \hat{E}_1 \hat{E}_2 [\ell(B_{t_1}; B_{t_2} \dots B_{t_1}; \dots; B_{t_n} \dots B_{t_{n-1}}; B_t \dots B_s)] \\ & \quad : \quad : \quad : \quad : \\ &= \hat{E}_1 \hat{E}_2 [\hat{E}_1 \hat{E}_2 [\ell(x; B_t \dots B_s)]_{k=(B_{t_1}; B_{t_2} \dots B_{t_1}; \dots; B_{t_n} \dots B_{t_{n-1}})}] \\ &= \hat{E}_1 \hat{E}_2 [\hat{E}_1 \hat{E}_2 [\ell(x; B_t \dots B_s)]_{k=(B_{t_1}; B_{t_2}; \dots; B_{t_n})}] \\ &= \hat{E}_1 \hat{E}_2 [\hat{E}_1 \hat{E}_2 [\ell(x_1; \dots; x_n; B_t \dots B_s)]_{(x_1; \dots; x_n) = (B_{t_1}; B_{t_2}; \dots; B_{t_n})}] : \end{aligned}$$

The proof of Lemma 4.8 is complete now.

Let us now come to the proof of Lemma 3.9.

Proof (of Lemma 3.9) : In a first step, we will prove that for each $\ell \in \text{C}_{\text{Lip}}(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})$ there exists a sequence of bounded Lipschitz functions $(\ell_N)_{N \geq 1}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \hat{E}_1 [\ell_N(B_{t_1}; B_{t_2}; \dots; B_{t_n}; B_t \dots B_s) - \ell(B_{t_1}; B_{t_2}; \dots; B_{t_n}; B_t \dots B_s)] \\ & \leq 0; \text{ as } N \rightarrow \infty : \end{aligned}$$

For this end we put

$$l_N(x) = (x \wedge N) - (N); N \geq 1; x \in \mathbb{R};$$

and

$$f'_N(x_1; \dots; x_{n+1}) = f'(l_N(x_1); \dots; l_N(x_{n+1}));$$

and we notice that

$$|f'_N(x) - f'_N(x)| \leq \frac{|x|^2}{N}; \text{ for all } x \in \mathbb{R};$$

Obviously, the functions f'_N are bounded and Lipschitz, and, moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} & |f'_N(x_1; \dots; x_{n+1}) - f'(x_1; \dots; x_{n+1})| \\ &= |f'_N(l_N(x_1); \dots; l_N(x_{n+1})) - f'(x_1; \dots; x_{n+1})| \\ &\leq C(1 + |x_1|^m + \dots + |x_{n+1}|^m) \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{|x_i|}{N} \\ &= \frac{C(1 + |x_1|^m + \dots + |x_{n+1}|^m) \sum_{i=1}^n |x_i|}{N}; \end{aligned}$$

where C and $m \geq 0$ are constants only depending on f' . Then, in virtue of the finiteness of $\hat{E}_1[(1 + |B_{t_1}|^m + \dots + |B_{t_n}|^m + |B_t - B_s|^m)(\sum_{i=1}^n |B_{t_i}|^4 + |B_t - B_s|^4)^{\frac{1}{2}}]$; we get

$$\hat{E}_1[|f'_N(B_{t_1}; B_{t_2}; \dots; B_{t_n}; B_t - B_s) - f'(B_{t_1}; B_{t_2}; \dots; B_{t_n}; B_t - B_s)|] \rightarrow 0; \text{ as } N \rightarrow \infty;$$

Let $x_1 = (x_1; \dots; x_n)$ and $Y_1 = (B_{t_1}; B_{t_2}; \dots; B_{t_n})$: Then, due to our above convergence result,

$$\begin{aligned} & \hat{E}_1 \hat{E}_2[f'_N(Y_1; B_t - B_s)] = \hat{E}_1 \hat{E}_2[f'(Y_1; B_t - B_s)] \\ & \hat{E}_1 \hat{E}_2[f'_N(Y_1; B_t - B_s) - f'(Y_1; B_t - B_s)] \\ & \hat{E}_1[f'_N(Y_1; B_t - B_s) - f'(Y_1; B_t - B_s)] \\ & \rightarrow 0; \text{ as } N \rightarrow \infty; \end{aligned}$$

and, from Lemma 4.3,

$$\begin{aligned} & \hat{E}_1 \hat{E}_2 \hat{E}_1 \hat{E}_2[f'_N(x_1; B_t - B_s)]_{x_1=Y_1} \\ & \hat{E}_1 \hat{E}_2 \hat{E}_1 \hat{E}_2[f'(x_1; B_t - B_s)]_{x_1=Y_1} \\ & \hat{E}_1 \hat{E}_2 \hat{E}_1 \hat{E}_2[f'_N(x_1; B_t - B_s) - f'(x_1; B_t - B_s)]_{x_1=Y_1} \\ & \hat{E}_1[f'_N(Y_1; B_t - B_s) - f'(Y_1; B_t - B_s)] \\ & \rightarrow 0; \text{ as } N \rightarrow \infty; \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, from Lemma 4.8 we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \hat{E}_1 \hat{E}_2 [\mathbb{P}_N(B_{t_1}; B_{t_2}; \dots; B_{t_n}; B_{t_n} - B_s)] \\ &= \hat{E}_1 \hat{E}_2 [\hat{E}_1 \hat{E}_2 [\mathbb{P}_N(x_1; \dots; x_n; B_{t_n} - B_s)]_{(x_1, \dots, x_n) = (B_{t_1}, B_{t_2}, \dots, B_{t_n})}]]: \end{aligned}$$

Combining the above results we can conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} & \hat{E}_1 \hat{E}_2 [\mathbb{P}(B_{t_1}; B_{t_2}; \dots; B_{t_n}; B_{t_n} - B_s)] \\ &= \hat{E}_1 \hat{E}_2 [\hat{E}_1 \hat{E}_2 [\mathbb{P}(x_1; \dots; x_n; B_{t_n} - B_s)]_{(x_1, \dots, x_n) = (B_{t_1}, B_{t_2}, \dots, B_{t_n})}]]: \end{aligned}$$

The proof is complete now.

Acknowledgements The authors thank Shige Peng, Ying Hu and Ming-shang Hu for careful reading and useful suggestions.

Reference

- [1] Artzner, Philippe; Delbaen, Freddy; Eber, Jean-Marc; Heath, David, Coherent measures of risk. *Math. Finance* 9 (1999), no. 3, 203{228.
- [2] Barrieu, Pauline; El Karoui, Nicole, Optimal design of derivatives in illiquid markets. *Quant. Finance* 2 (2002), no. 3, 181{188.
- [3] Barrieu, Pauline; El Karoui, Nicole, Optimal derivatives design under dynamic risk measures. *Mathematics of Finance*, 13{25, *Contemp. Math.*, 351, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2004.
- [4] Barrieu, Pauline; El Karoui, Nicole, Inf-convolution of risk measures and optimal risk transfer. *Finance Stoch.* 9 (2005), no. 2, 269{298.
- [5] Chen, Zengjing; Epstein, Larry, Ambiguity, risk, and asset returns in continuous time. *Econometrica* 70 (2002), no. 4, 1403{1443.
- [6] El Karoui, N.; Peng, S.; Quenez, M. C., Backward stochastic differential equations in finance. *Math. Finance* 7 (1997), no. 1, 1{71.
- [7] Rosazza Gianin, Emanuela, Risk measures via g-expectations. *Insurance Math. Econom.* 39 (2006), no. 1, 19{34.
- [8] Delbaen, Freddy, Coherent risk measures, *Cattedra Galileiana. [Galileo Chair] Scuola Normale Superiore, Classe di Scienze, Pisa*, 2000.
- [9] Delbaen, Freddy, Coherent risk measures on general probability spaces. *Advances in Finance and Stochastics*, 1{37, Springer, Berlin, 2002.

- [10] Föllmer, Hans; Schied, Alexander, Convex measures of risk and trading constraints. *Finance Stoch.* 6 (2002), no. 4, 429{447.
- [11] Föllmer, Hans; Schied, Alexander, Robust preferences and convex measures of risk. *Advances in finance and stochastics*, 39{56, Springer, Berlin, 2002.
- [12] Frittelli, Marco; Rosazza Gianin, Emanuela, Putting order in risk measures. *Journal of Banking and Finance* 26 (2002), no. 7, 1473-1486.
- [13] Frittelli, Marco; Rosazza Gianin, Emanuela, Dynamic Convex Risk measures, in: *Risk measures for the 21st Century*, G. Szegö., J.W. Wiley, 2004, 227-248.
- [14] Pardoux, Etienne; Peng, S. G., Adapted solution of a backward stochastic differential equation. *Systems Control Lett.* 14 (1990), no. 1, 55{61.
- [15] Peng, S., Backward SDE and related g -expectation. *Backward stochastic differential equations (Paris, 1995{1996)*, 141{159, Pitman Res. Notes Math. Ser., 364, Longman, Harlow, 1997.
- [16] Peng, S., Dynamically consistent nonlinear evaluations and expectations, *arXiv math/0501415v1 [math.PR]* 24 Jan 2005.
- [17] Peng, S., Multidimensional G -Brownian motion and related stochastic calculus under G -expectation, *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, Vol. 118, Issue 12, Dec. (2008), 2223-2253.
- [18] Peng, Shige, G -expectation, G -Brownian motion and related stochastic calculus of Itô type. *Stochastic analysis and applications*, 541{567, Abel Sym p., 2, Springer, Berlin, 2007.
- [19] Peng, S., G -Brownian Motion and Dynamic Risk Measures under Volatility Uncertainty, *arXiv:0711.2834v1 [math.PR]* 19 Nov 2007.